REMARKS

Claims 1-36 were pending as of the office action mailed August 12, 2008. Claims 10, 11, 23, 25-31, 34 and 35 are being amended. Claim 37 is new. No new matter is added. Claims 1, 10, 11, 13, 22, 23, 25, 34 and 35 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting. Claims 11, 12, 23, 24, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,301,267 ("Hassett"). Claims 2-9, 14-21 and 26-33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are allowable if rewritten in independent form. The applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests reconsideration and reexamination in view of the amendments and remarks herein.

I. Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 10, 11, 13, 22, 23, 25, 34 and 35 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 7,408,555. For the sake of expediting prosecution, and without prejudice, the applicant submits herewith a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321 to overcome the rejection based on nonstatutory double patenting. The applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

II. 102 Rejections

Claims 11, 12, 23, 24, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Hassett.

Claims 11 and 12

Claim 11, as amended, recites a computer-implemented method as follows:

> A computer-implemented method, comprising, in a processor operatively coupled to a display device, performing the actions of:
>
> receiving a plurality of glyphs to be rendered, where each glyph includes a respective glyph outline;
>
> for each glyph, before generating any raster representation of the glyph, using an entire value of a scaled stem width that applies to the glyph as a whole to select a rendering policy for rendering the glyph as a whole, where a rendering policy comprises a plurality of parameters for rendering the glyph including a hinting policy, and modifying the glyph outline in accordance with the hinting policy included in the selected rendering policy to generate a modified glyph outline, the glyph outline and the modified glyph outline each comprising a respective closed path defined by a font program specifying a connected sequence of lines or curves or both; and
>
> rasterizing the modified glyph outline and generating a raster representation of the glyph from the rasterized modified glyph outline in accordance with the selected rendering policy for presentation on the display device.

The claim recites that for each glyph an entire value of a scaled stem width is used to select a rendering policy for rendering the glyph. The claim clearly indicates that a rendering policy includes a plurality of parameters for rendering the glyph including a hinting policy. The Examiner relies on Hassett at Col. 11, line 51 to Col. 12, line 14 and equations 1-4 as disclosing these limitations of claim 11. Hassett discloses a technique that is directed at keeping the edges of stems within a certain boundary within a device pixel, i.e., away from the center and the edges of the device pixel. The technique is implemented on a stem-by-stem basis. For each stem, the fractional portion of the stem width (i.e., not the entire value of the stem width) is used to determine an amount, if any, by which to adjust the width of the particular stem. There are a number of differences between this technique and the method recited in claim 11.

First, claim 11 requires using the "entire value of a scaled stem width that applies to the glyph as a whole". The term "standard stem width" is discussed and defined in the applicant's specification at page 10. As discussed, typically a font defines a standard stem width that applies to all glyphs within the font, however, the standard stem width can be determined in a number of ways, depending on the available information (see p.10, lines 7-16). The term "scaled stem width" is defined in the specification as the standard stem width scaled to the size at which the glyph is to be rendered (see p. 10, lines 17-19). The scaled stem width is a value that applies to the glyph as a whole, i.e., it is not determined on a stem-by-stem basis for a glyph that has more

than one stem. By contrast, Hassett's technique uses the fractional portion of a particular stem width to determine whether or not (and by how much) to adjust that particular stem width; Hassett does not use a scaled stem width that applies to the glyph as a whole. Additionally, Hassett does not use the entire value of the stem width, but rather only the fractional portion.

Second, claim 11 requires using the scaled stem width to select a rendering policy, where the rendering policy includes a plurality of parameters for rendering the glyph, including a hinting policy. The Examiner has not explained where in Hassett there is a disclosure of using a scaled stem width to select a rendering policy. At most, the portions of Hassett relied on by the Examiner show using a fractional portion of a stem width to determine an amount by which to adjust the width of the particular corresponding stem. The claim defines a rendering policy as including "a plurality of parameters for rendering the glyph including a hinting policy". A width adjustment to a single stem in a glyph is not a "plurality of parameters for rendering the glyph", in particular when the rendering policy is required to apply to the glyph as a whole, i.e., not just particular stem.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Hassett does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 11, and claim 11 is therefore in condition for allowance. Claim 12 depends from claim 11 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 23 and 24

Claims 23 and 24 recite a computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program comprising instructions to cause a programmable processor to perform certain actions. The actions include using an entire value of a scaled stem width that applies to the glyph as a whole to select a rendering policy for rendering a glyph as a whole. The rendering policy includes a plurality of parameters including a hinting policy. For at least the reasons discussed above in reference to claim 11, the limitations of claim 23 are not disclosed by Hassett. Claim 23 and claim 24 which depends therefrom are therefore in condition for allowance.

Claims 35 and 36

Claim 35 recites a system including a processor and a storage device coupled to the processor and configurable for storing instructions. The instructions, when executed by the processor, cause the processor to perform operations including using an entire value of a scaled stem width that applies to the glyph as a whole to select a rendering policy for rendering a glyph

as a whole. The rendering policy includes a plurality of parameters including a hinting policy. For at least the reasons discussed above in reference to claim 11, the limitations of claim 35 are not disclosed by Hassett. Claim 35 and claim 36 which depend therefrom are therefore in condition for allowance.

III. Other Amendments and New Claim

Claims 25-31 has been rewritten to remove means + function language and claim 25 has been amended to recite a processor and a storage device coupled to the processor. Claims 25-31 were previously allowed by the Examiner. The applicant respectfully submits that claims 25-21, as amended, continue to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 37 is new and recites a method for rendering a glyph to make the glyph more readable. A processor is operatively coupled to a display device and performs certain actions recited in the claim. The actions recited are similar to the limitations set forth in claim 1, which the Examiner has previously found allowable. Accordingly, for at least this reason, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 37 is in condition for allowance.

IV. Conclusion

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the Examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

The excess claim fee in the amount of $220 is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 07844-0636001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:November 12, 2008_____

/Brenda M. Leeds Binder/_____
Brenda M. Leeds Binder
Reg. No. 57,520

Customer No. 21876
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50616750.doc